

## ***Interactive comment on “Comparison of spatial association approaches for landscape mapping of soil organic carbon stocks” by B. A. Miller et al.***

**B. A. Miller et al.**

miller@zalf.de

Received and published: 30 January 2015

On behalf of the authors, we thank you for reviewing our manuscript.

We appreciate the comments by the reviewers and believe that we have utilized them to improve manuscript. We understand reviewer 1's concern about the sampling design and the consideration of spatial autocorrelation. We have directly responded to those concerns in our response to that reviewer. We have also revised the manuscript to better clarify why the sample design appropriately covers the feature space needed to model the mapped area and how spatial autocorrelation is incorporated in the estimated error maps.

We are also grateful for reviewer 2's comments, which we have added text to the  
C517

manuscript to better clarify the answers to their questions. Specifically, we have added more details about how we addressed the risk of overfitting by Cubist, as you highlighted.

In addition to the direct responses to the reviewer comments, we have attached here the revised manuscript that includes marks for the changes we made in light of the reviewers' comments.

Best regards, -Bradley Miller

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.soil-discuss.net/1/C517/2015/soild-1-C517-2015-supplement.pdf>

---

Interactive comment on SOIL Discuss., 1, 757, 2014.